6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

another instrument at the disposal of the father in imposing

discipline on his son consisted of threat of disinheritance and banishment. If an unmarried son left the paternal house during the lifetime of his father to establish his own separate household, the father was not obliged to give him anything and might even let him go "with nothing but his cross" (*s odnim krestom*).[8] But if a married son left with his father's consent, it was the privilege of the father to determine what his share should be.[9] Also in his testamentary disposition, the father was entitled to dispose of family property at will. The father also had the right to disinherit his son and chase him away from home as a punishment for bad behavior, especially disobedience.[10] He also had the power to select the disobedient son for military conscription. According to some sources the father had the right to sell his son "four times."[11] He might show predilection in testamentary disposition.[12] Many tales tell of a father's favoritism toward an obedient son.[13]

But the way the father used most often to impose his will and assert his power was coercion (*prinuzhdenie*) by means of physical beating (*poboi*). The horse whip and the birch rod (*rozga*) were used freely in family relations. The *Domostroy*, a code of Great-Russian family practices and ethics of the urban strata compiled and edited in the sixteenth century by Priest Sylvester, a councillor and confessor of Ivan the Terrible, prescribes in detail the application of corporal punishment as a sanction of the father's authority and rule:

> Beat your son in his youth, and he will comfort you in your old age . . . And do not weaken in beating the child. Beating with a rod will not kill him, but will make him healthier . . . If you will be weak in his childhood, he will make you suffer when he grows up . . . And give him no power in youth but crush his ribs while he is growing, because when he is big he will not obey you, and you will feel annoyed and ill at heart, and your house will be ruined . . . and your enemies will rejoice at your misfortune.[14]

The popular philosophy of life as expressed in the Great-Russian folk proverbs approves of the teachings of the Domostroy. "If God gives you sons, don't be lazy, teach them and beat them"; "If he did not obey his father, he will obey the whip,"

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

593 861 the people would say. Hence, made secure by the prevailing philosophy of life, upheld by court decisions and supported by Church teachings on the supernatural sanction of his will, the father might be tempted to take advantage of his unlimited power and to expose his son to excessively severe and humiliating treatment. "I had born you and I shall kill you," said Taras Bulba to his son and shot him to death.[15]

593 The father might also take advantage of his uncontrolled power in the use of family property and funds. He might gamble them away, spend them on debauchery, or bring the family to ruin as a result of drunkenness or mismanagement. Such incidents in Russian families are often described in autobiographies and other writings of Russian men of letters. It is characteristic of Great-Russian family relations that the other family members were not expected to complain against such extreme abuse of paternal authority.[16] Hence in all strata of Russian society, there was a tendency to accept anything the father did, even the most degrading treatment, as his paternal prerogative. Even if a father had ruined his family because of gambling or lechery he was still held in reverence both by his society and by his children.[17]

606 835 Occasionally, particularly among the peasants, the father might take sexual advantage of his daughters-in-law, a practice which became known as *snokhachestvo* (*snokha* is daughter-in-law). This habit, which was already noticed by the writer of the Kiev Chronicle, was favored by the frequent absences of married sons who spent a part of the year in the city as workers or who were away from home for many years, or indefinitely, when conscripted for military duty. "The more women in the house, the more sin" (*Bolshe bab v semie, bolshe greha*),[18] the people would comment.

593 562 As much as the traditions of the steppe warriors prevailed in the Great-Russian patriarchal family the wife was placed on an equal footing with her children in relation to her husband. She had to show absolute submission and blind obedience to her husband. "The husband is father to his wife" (*Muzh zhene otets*);[19] "Christ is the head of the Church, the husband that of

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

These attitudes implied complete dependency and self-abnegation on the part of the wife and children in relation to their master. The wife and the children were expected always to speak with respect to the father, that is, in the second person plural instead of the second person singular—the way the children addressed each other or their mother. The wife did not address her husband by his first name, but by his first and second name (patronymic) which was the way less intimate acquaintances addressed each other. The children had to demonstrate their thankfulness for the father's care and solicitude by kissing his hands. Before a bride left her parental home, custom demanded that she say to her father, "God will help you for bread and salt." And he would advise her to be obedient to her new relations: "Be obedient to them the way you were obedient to me" (*slushay kak menia slushala*).[7]

Emphasis on fear and awe, obedience and gratitude was very outstanding in the Great-Russian patriarchal family relations. These feelings and attitudes had a supernatural sanction. As a result of the teachings of the Russian Orthodox Church, it was considered in popular opinion that any disobedience or disrespect of the father's will was mercilessly punished by God who brought life-long misery and misfortune for such unfilial behavior. Even after death, the soul of a disobedient and ungrateful child could hardly escape punishment in the eternal fire of hell. Many Great-Russian folktales place a great emphasis on obedience and gratitude and stress the cruel penalty and fearful fate that awaited a disobedient and ungrateful son.[8]

Such family relations in which demands of a harsh and detached, and even capricious and arbitrary father had to be answered by humility, unconditional submission, blind obedience, love and gratitude; in which family members fought over priorities and rights; where all felt dependent upon one another and isolated from the rest of the world, could not fail to provoke tensions and cause intense family antagonisms and animosities. Such tensions and conflicts became characteristic of the Great-Russian patriarchal family and were manifested in the relations between husband and wife, father and sons, between the siblings and between the in-laws.[9]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

ment of moderation and emotional integration. In the early Slav society, mother's role in all family affairs was very significant. With the growth of the patriarchal family, one of her important duties came to be that of intercessor and of protector against the wrath of the father. In the patriarchal family the mother was not the chief disciplinarian; therefore she did not have to resort to threat, violence, privations, and humiliation as a means of discipline. Her punishments were mild and her main means of control were those of love and reasoning. Her authority and self-respect were therefore not endangered by being close to children and by being on familiar terms with them. She was always available and approachable. The children, therefore, felt much more at ease and free in the presence of their mother than in that of their father.[1]

The mother, if feeling neglected, abused or degraded by a remote and harsh husband, was likely to seek compensation for the lack of love and for wounded self-esteem by being over-protective and over-affectionate in relation to her children, expecting indulgent response from them. The son, if barred in his desire for attachment to his father or if abused and humiliated by him, might feel the more attracted to his mother as a means of emotional outlet and as compensation for feelings of rejection and humiliation.

It is this role of the mother as warm protector and close friend that has been expressed in folk sayings and other products of folk philosophy and imagination. "Fear your father, and respect your mother" says a Russian folk proverb pointing out the sharp contrast in the attitude of a child toward his father and his mother. The folk sayings emphasize also the intimate and tender bond that exists between mother and child and the importance of such close ties for the child. "Without a father the child is half orphan, without a mother a child is a complete orphan"; "Mother's beating does not hurt"; "Mother raises her hand high, but does not strike hard." Because of such close mother-child relationship, it was considered in the popular view of life that mother's influence on the child was in the long run deeper than that of the father. "What mother puts into the child's head, the father will not knock out," the people would say.

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

593 154 517

Some Russian intellectual leaders and men of letters, such as Dobrolyubov, Ostrovsky, Herzen and Kropotkin were very much impressed by the effect which Russian family atmosphere had in shaping the personality of the Russian people, especially the intelligentsia. Herzen pointed out that in a family in which there was "much to hate and despise, and almost nothing to love and to respect," the psychological development was not full, but warped. In a similar manner Kropotkin explains that people who are brought up in families in which the personal relationships between children and their parents are based not on love and mutual respect but on fear and unconditional submission become both domineering and servile, as well as rebellious:

[861] A child's spirit is weak. It is so easy to coerce it by fear . . . They make the child timid, and they talk to him of the torments of hell. They conjur up before him the sufferings of the condemned, and vengeance of an implacable God . . . and by that habit of submission the thought of the next generation attains this religious twist, which is at once servile and authoritative: for authority and servility walk ever hand in hand. . . . Then the degradation of the ruler and of the judges, of the clergy and of the more or less comfortable classes becomes so revolting that the pendulum begins to swing the other way.[16]

The family environment, however, is itself an integral part of the society to which it belongs and is therefore interacting with it. Hence an understanding of the structure of the whole society, of the view of life, traditional culture and general orientation of its various strata, of the configuration of its interpersonal, institutional and power relationships is necessary in order to explain personality formation and peculiarities of behavior of a people.[17] It is in such a total context that also the direct and the indirect influences of physical environment or of any other "external" pressures might be correctly appraised.

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

group which claims perfection and monopoly on Truth cannot afford to lay itself open to any fundamental criticism of its accomplishments. Figures are therefore manipulated so as to achieve the desired effect.[22] "In the land of the Soviets statistics have become a weapon for Socialism and Communism," the Bolsheviks say.

II

Shaping of the "new man" must begin early in his childhood. To answer to this need, the schools have become in the Soviet system one of the fundamental instruments of character molding in the hands of the ruling faction. Special measures must be applied by educators to fashion character since "the life itself would not do it," the Bolsheviks say. The schools in the Soviet society have therefore a twofold objective. The first is to develop in each and every child psychological traits which are considered most desirable from the point of view of the perpetuation of the Soviet system and Bolshevik rule. The other is to develop needed skills and to train specialists which are of fundamental importance in a system of total control, such as experts in conspiracy, political organization and agitation, in overseeing, in vigilance and violence.

In a thoroughly regimented society training in unconditional obedience and in identification with and dependence upon the leader is of paramount importance. Such personality traits, already rooted in the Russian social and political structure, are being reinforced by the system of training in the Soviet schools whose pedagogical principles in their essentials do not differ from the precepts of the Domostroy. "From early years we must educate children so that a state of discipline will remain as their permanent possession," says a textbook on Soviet pedagogy.[23] "This discipline must be *firm*, that is, unquestioned obedience and submission to the leader, the teacher, or the organizer . . . " Submission to the will of the leader "is a necessary and essential mark of discipline."[24]

According to these pedagogical ideas the teacher does not coax pupils, he *demands* obedience.[25] The teacher is expected to be "authoritative and strict." Whenever necessary he must give

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

in the political philosophy expressed in Soviet writings and in the speeches of outstanding Party members, extreme hatred of the internal and external adversaries is considered as a precondition of Bolshevik victory and of survival of Soviet society. Thus, for instance, in a May Day Order of the Day, Stalin, as People's Commissar of Defense declared: "You cannot defeat any enemy without having learned to hate him with all the power of your soul." In Soviet writings Lenin is hailed as a man who had "a holy hatred of the oppressors of the people . . . "[12]

Just like the Anarchists before them, the Bolsheviks claim that a deliberate cult of hatred is a precondition for the development of a "revolutionary passion." They justify hatred as a means to achieve their revolutionary goals. Following the same traditions the Bolsheviks insist that fanatical devotion should be instilled in people as a means to arouse passionate hatred. Therefore deliberate cultivation of hate together with the training in extreme identification with the Leader, the Party, the Motherland, and the Communist cause must start with kindergarten and with school training of Soviet children. Passionate hatred and passionate love are expected to mutually strengthen each other. According to pedagogical teachings, the Soviet children should be "saturated with irreconcilable hatred toward the enemies of socialist society," as well as with "passionate love of the Motherland." But here too just as in the Anarchist precepts, hatred appears to take the first place and love the second:

> Hatred gives birth to class revolutionary vigilance and creates a feeling of irreconcilability toward the class enemy; the weakening of such vigilance undermines the cause of the socialist revolution. It is necessary to learn, not only to hate the enemy, but also to struggle with him, in time to unmask him and finally, if he does not surrender, to destroy him . . . to vanquish the enemy is impossible without the most burning hatred of him . . . Passionate love of the motherlands breeds inevitably strong hatred of the enemy.[13]

Many outstanding Soviet novelists in their writings emphasize this cult of destructive aggression. Maxim Gorki, for instance, wrote an essay entitled "If the enemy does not surrender, he must be destroyed." Konstantin Simonov, another outstanding Soviet